

### Remarks

In response to the final Office Action dated October 17, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

In the present application, independent claims 1, 7, 12, and 16 have been amended to specifically track the language used in the specification regarding voice input being spoken words. Support for these amendments, which is discussed in more detail below, may be found in paragraphs 0034, 0039, 0047, and 0049 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 7, 9-12 and 16-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification allegedly does not provide enablement for the voice inputs to be provided as whole word inputs. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Support for such recitations is supported at paragraph 0039, for example, which specifically refers to voice recognition module 305 perform speech-to-text operations that translate spoken words into text and further refers to recognizing the voice inputs to complete data fields . Spoken words are whole word inputs. Furthermore, paragraph 0034 points out that when entering information such as account information into data fields, that such voice inputs are an alternative to typing text. Thus, Applicants assert that the whole word voice input for the client account information is fully supported.

However, to ensure that that prosecution may proceed expeditiously, Applicants have amended the independent claims to use precisely the language used in the specification at paragraph 0039. Namely, these claims have been amended to refer to spoken words as voice inputs, as opposed to whole word voice inputs. Applicants assert that these amendments are fully supported by the description provided in paragraphs 0034 and 0039.

Applicants have further amended claims 7, 12, and 16 to recite spoken Go To commands and spoken TAB commands. Applicants assert that paragraph 0047

specifically describes the user saying “Go To” or saying “TAB” as an input to the TechNet application. Thus, these claim recitations are also fully supported by the specification.

Therefore, Applicants assert that the pending rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112 should be withdrawn for at least these reasons.

#### Prior art rejections

Applicants assert that the arguments previously made, which are apparently successful in view of the Office Action’s indication that such arguments are now moot in view of new grounds of rejection, continue to apply after the above amendments. Where the arguments previously referred to whole word voice inputs, the spoken words as voice inputs now apply with equal effect. Therefore, Applicants assert that all prior art rejections have been addressed by the previous response and continue to be addressed by the present response.

#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants assert that this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants’ attorney at the number listed below.

No fees are believed due beyond the fee for continued examination. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Date: October 31, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeramie J. Keys/  
Jeramie J. Keys, 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC  
P.O. Box 71355  
Marietta, GA 30007-1355  
(678) 565-4748